

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 13, 16-17, 19 and 21 have been amended. Claims 3-5, 8-12, 14-15, 18, 20 and 22-23 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 24 and 25 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-2, 6-7, 13, 16-17, 19, 21 and 24-25 are presented for examination.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 13-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ullmann, et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,120,685 (“Ullmann”).

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A system comprising:

a computer system including an application server, the application server to

generate unified log and trace messages relating to one or more software applications by synergizing configuration settings of a logging mechanism and a tracing mechanism, wherein synergizing includes unifying message paths of log messages and trace messages and establishing cross-referencing between log information of the log messages and trace information of the trace messages, the unified log and trace messages being independent of programming languages and any particular interfaces, output formats, and destination files associated with each of the programming languages; and

a viewer in communication with the computer system, the viewer to display the unified log and trace messages.

(emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner’s characterization of the reference and the pending claims. Applicants contend that Ullman discloses a system for *adjusting the frequency* at which *tracing and logging* are performed. (see col. 2, lines 12-27). For example, Ullman discloses “provid[ing] a system and method whereby the *logging and tracing* of computing activities in a distributed computing system can be *selectively enabled and/or disabled*.” (col. 1, lines 62-65; emphasis added). Nowhere

does Ullman teach or reasonably suggest “unified log and trace messages” as recited by claim 1 (emphasis added).

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, recites “generat[ing] unified log and trace messages relating to one or more software applications by synergizing configuration settings of a logging mechanism and a tracing mechanism, wherein synergizing includes unifying message paths of log messages and trace messages and establishing cross-referencing between log information of the log messages and trace information of the trace messages”. (emphasis added). Ullman discloses tracing and logging, but it does not teach or reasonably suggest unifying the logging and tracing messages as recited by claim 1. Further, Ullman relates to *adjusting the frequency at which tracing and logging are performed*; for example, Ullman provides a *GUI-based form* to the user to help select *how often* (e.g., daily, monthly, continuously etc.) tracing or logging is to be performed. (see Figure 4). Applicants submit that not only Ullman’s *scheduling technique* is *irrelevant* to claim 1’s unified log and trace messages, but also Ullman’s *tracing messages and logging messages are provided and frequency-adjusted separately* which *teaches away* from synergizing configuration settings of logging and tracing mechanisms and wherein synergizing includes unifying message paths of log messages and trace messages and establishing cross-referencing between log information and trace information to generate unified log and trace messages of claim 1.

Claim 1 further recites unified log and trace messages being independent of programming languages and any particular interfaces, output formats, and destination files associated with each of the programming languages. Nowhere does Ullman teach or reasonably suggest its logging and tracing messages being independent of programming languages or of any particular interfaces, output formats, and destination files associated

with each of the programming languages as recited by claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 13 and 19 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the same reasons as set forth above with reference to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 19 and their dependent claims.

New Claims

New claims 24 and 25 depend from one of claims 13 and 19 and thus include all the limitations of the corresponding base claim. Applicants submit the new claims are allowable over the cited reference.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: April 24, 2009

/Aslam A. Jaffery/

Aslam A. Jaffery

Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980